

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in view of the above-referenced Final Office Action, and reconsideration is requested in view of the following remarks. This submission is presented along with an RCE.

Regarding the Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

All claims have been rejected based upon obviousness in light of the combination of Fangman, Arnold and Chakraborty of record. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections as follows.

Applicants stand by the remarks made in the prior response and further submits that the combination is defective at least in that Fangman fails to disclose “where the client attempts discovery within the scope defined by option 43. The Office submits that this is disclosed at [0280], Fig. 5A and Item 506. This disclosure only teaches that the client issues a DHCP Discover with class identifier. As disclosed in [0280], the DHCP discover request of item 506 only serves to request a DHCP dynamically assigned IP address. There is no teaching, suggestion or articulated reasoning with rational underpinning as required to explain how this can be equated to discovery within a scope defined by option 43 as called out in the claims.

The claims have been amended to highlight and emphasize that in provisioning “the DHCP services use DHCP option 43 to define a scope of the subscriber site in which the scope is defined to be equal to a maximum number of potential peer terminals at the subscriber site and wherein the DHCP services use DHCP option 12 to define a common host name including a number for the terminal wherein the number falls within the scope of the subscriber site; wherein the home entertainment network terminal is identified within the home network by an address comprising a concatenation of the terminal identifier and the host name; and carrying out a discovery process by attempting to contact each terminal within the sub-domain within the scope of the subscriber site defined by the DHCP option 43, wherein the discovery process is limited by the maximum number of potential peer terminals at the subscriber site”. Thus, DHCP option 43 defines a maximum number of potential peer terminals so as to limit the search during the discovery process. Clearly also, the discovery process is not “requesting a DHCP dynamically

assigned IP address” as described in paragraph [0280] of Fangman. These features are implicit by virtue of the use of the term “scope” and the use of the term “discovery” as is characterized in the specification in the previously submitted claims. Therefor, these features merely make explicit and clarify that which was implicit previously.

Additionally, the present claims as amended call for “the home entertainment network terminal is identified within the home network by an address comprising a concatenation of the terminal identifier and the host name”. On review of the cited references, the undersigned does not believe that there is any teaching or suggestion of such a feature, and points out that inherently the terminal identifier is within the “scope” of the subscriber site by virtue of the explicit definition in the claims. Hence, this feature further distinguishes the claims over the cited art.

In view of these clear distinctions and the distinctions argued in the prior response, Applicant submits that all claims are allowable. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested at an early date.

Concluding Remarks

The undersigned additionally notes that many other distinctions exist between the cited art and the claims. However, in view of the clear distinctions pointed out above in connection with the independent claims, further discussion is believed to be unnecessary at this time. Failure to address each point raised in the Office Action should accordingly not be viewed as accession to the Examiner’s position or an admission of any sort. Applicants reserve the right to argue any of the points presented for the rejection of the dependent claims at a later date.

Interview Request

In view of this communication, all claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance and such is respectfully requested at an early date. If further matters remain to be resolved, the undersigned respectfully requests the courtesy of an interview. The undersigned can be reached at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jerry A. Miller 30779/

Jerry A. Miller
Registration No. 30,779

Dated: 7/17/2008

Please Send Correspondence to:
Jerry A. Miller
Miller Patent Services
2500 Dockery Lane
Raleigh, NC 27606
Phone: (919) 816-9981
Fax: (919) 816-9982
Customer Number 24337